

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated November 10, 2003, the Applicants filed an Amendment on May 10, 2004. That Amendment included new claims 58-68. The Office Action notes that claims 58-68 were added to the application without pointing out how those claims are patentable over the cited references. This Reply is believed to correct that omission.

Claims 1-57 should be allowed over the cited references for the reasons noted in the Amendment, the remarks of which are incorporated herein by reference.

Independent Claim 58 is of the same scope as Claim 1 and is therefore patentable for the same reasons as Claim 1.

Independent Claim 59 recites the combined subject matter of Claims 11, 12, and 16 and is patentable for the same reasons any of those claims are patentable. Claims 60 and 61 add additional patentable limitations to Claim 59. Similarly, independent Claim 62 recites the combined subject matter of Claims 30, 31, and 35 and is patentable for the same reasons any of those claims are patentable, and Claims 63 and 64 add additional patentable limitations to Claim 62.

Claims 65-67 are of the same scope as Claims 59-61 (and therefore also Claims 11, 12, and 16) and are patentable for the same reasons. Likewise, Claim 68 is also of the same scope as Claim 59 (and therefore also Claim 11) and is patentable for the same reasons.

Acceptance of the Amendment filed on May 10, 2004, and allowance of Claims 1-68 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By 
Rodney D. Johnson
Registration No. 36,558
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated: *October 12, 2007*